

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/509,808	FISCHER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lawrence D. Ferguson	1774	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lawrence D. Ferguson. (3)_____.

(2) Marvin Turken. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 06 December 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued the amendments made on June 28, 2005 are supported by the substitute specification filed on April 14, 2003. Examiner noted the specification filed April 14, 2003 was grouped with Applicant's arguments filed the same day so the substitute specification was not considered and the specification filed July 31, 2000, was considered for the new matter rejection mailed October 7, 2005. Examiner suggested that Applicant note the arguments made in the response to the office action mailed October 7, 2005..